



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,505	01/06/2004		Tatsuo Saishu	246188US2SRD DIV	3328
22850	7590	07/12/2005		EXAM	INER
OBLON, S	•	MCCLELLAND	LAO, LUN YI		
	ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•			2673	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/751,505	SAISHU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lao Y Lun	2673
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH ute, cause the application to become ABAN	be timely filed  io) days will be considered timely.  S from the mailing date of this communication.  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 2a) ■ This action is FINAL. 2b) ■ Th 3) ■ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters	·
Disposition of Claims		·
4)	is/are withdrawn from conside e rejected.	eration.
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 January 2004</u> is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	re: a) accepted or b) objected or b) objected or b) objected in abeyance ection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in App iority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No. <u>09/942,743</u> . ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	<del></del>	mary (PTO-413) lail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/751,505 Page 2

Art Unit: 2673

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 2, 4-5, 9, 11-12, 16 and 18-19 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-24 of copending Application No. 10/982,889(US-2005/0083288A1). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a liquid crystal display comprising: a ferroelectric liquid crystal material which is held between a pair of electrode substrates and whose optical response is asymmetric with respect to the polarity of a voltage applied; a signal applying section which applies an image signal to a pixel of the liquid crystal material for every three or more fields; and a polarity controller which reverses the polarity of the image signal in one frame period, wherein the polarity controller being configured to apply the image signal of a first polarity(positive) of each field in a first one of two

Art Unit: 2673

successive periods obtained by dividing the frame period, and to apply the image signal of a second polarity opposite(negative) to the first polarity(positive) and of fixed amplitudes being applied for each subsequent field in a second one of the two successive periods and the amplitude of the image signal for the last field that depends on the amplitude of image signal for the next frame.(see claims 22-24).

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 6-7, 13-14 and 20-21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-24 of copending Application No. 10/982,889 in view Kuribayashi et al(4,709,995),

The copending application(claims 22-24) fail to disclose fields having different time lengths.

Kuribayashi et al teach a ferroelectric liquid crystal display having a plurality of fields having different time lengths (see figures 3, 6; abstract; column 5, lines 39-68 and column 1-23). It would have been obvious to have modified Asao et al as modified with the teaching of the copending application, so as to provide different levels of grayscale on a display.

## Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16 and 18-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lun-yi Lao whose telephone number is 571-272-7671. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Application/Control Number: 10/751,505 Page 5

Art Unit: 2673

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 571-272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 10, 2005

Lun-yi Lao

**Primary Examiner**